

REMARKS

This is a response to the Office Action mailed on January 25, 2007, in this application. Claims 1-9 are presented for examination. Claims 1 and 9 are currently amended. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments do not introduce new matter. Individual issues raised in the Office Action are addressed next.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walburger (US 6,597,240) in view of Hasegawa (US 6,169,449).

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Walburger discloses the features “a switch controller, which senses the first power supply voltage and the second power supply voltage and generates a first control signal for controlling the first switch and a second control signal for controlling the second switch” and “the switch controller turns on the first switch and the second switch until the first power supply voltage and the second power supply voltage reach respective threshold voltages and turns off the first switch and the second switch after the first power supply voltage and the second power supply voltage reach respective threshold voltages” as recited in independent claim 1 of the present invention. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees based on the following:.

The switch controller claimed in claim 1 is directly connected with first and second power supply voltage lines so as to directly sense the first power supply voltage and the second power supply voltage.

In contrast, control (308a, 308b) of Walburger is connected with common node (303) drains of transistors (302a, 302b) through comparators (310a, 310b) and not directly connected with power lines (VD, V0). That is, the control (308a, 308b) senses an output of the comparators (310a, 310b), not power voltages of the power lines (VD, V0).

For the reasons set forth above Walburger fails to teach or suggest the above-mentioned features as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

The Examiner also asserts that Walburger fails to teach or suggest the second voltage being a second power supply voltage, and offers Hasegawa to remedy this deficiency. However, Applicant disagrees.

There is no motivation to combine the teaching of Hasegawa into Walburger due to the fact that the technical field of the Walburger's patent is different from that of the Hasegawa' patent. The Walburger patent relates to an audio amplifier but the Hasegawa patent relates to a transmission power control circuit in a CDMA system. Furthermore, Hasegawa does not teach or suggest the above-mentioned features as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Since neither Hasegawa nor Walburger, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 1, as amended, nor is there any motivation to combine these references, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn. Since claims 2-6 are dependent claims dependent on claim 1, the rejections of these claims should also be withdrawn, for at least this reason.

Similar to independent claim 1, independent claim 9 recites the features "sensing the first power supply voltage and the second power supply voltage; as a result of the sensing, when the first power supply voltage does not reach a first threshold voltage, applying the first power supply voltage to the gate of the power PMOS transistor, and when the second power supply voltage does not reach a second threshold voltage, applying the second power supply voltage to the gate of the power NMOS transistor; and as a result of the sensing, after the first power supply voltage reaches the first threshold voltage, not applying the first power supply voltage to the gate of the power PMOS transistor, and after the second power supply voltage does not reach the second threshold voltage, not applying the second power supply voltage to the gate of the power NMOS transistor".

According to the reasons set forth above as to independent claim 1, none of cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-mentioned features of independent claim 9. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 9 should be withdrawn.

Allowable Claims

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 7-8 would be allowable if re-written in independent form. However, in light of the above remarks, Applicant submits that these claims are patentable as dependent on claim 1. The objections to these claims should therefore be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. A favorable disposition to that effect is respectfully requested.

No fee is believed to be due for this submission. In the event a fee is required please charge such a fee to Jones Day Deposit Account No. 50-3013.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments concerning this submission, he is invited to call the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

Date: April 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



For Yeah-Sil Moon (Reg. No. 52, 042)

By Lawrence R. Gabuzda (Reg. No. 51,711)

JONES DAY

222 East 41st Street

New York, New York 10017

(212) 326-3939